



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,944	09/27/2001	Robert A. Dunstan	42390P11892	5051

8791 7590 02/22/2007  
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER
----------

TRAN, NGHI V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/22/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/966,944	DUNSTAN, ROBERT A.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Nghi V. Tran	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-22, 24, 26, 28 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-22, 24, 26, 28 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on January 26, 2007. Claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 13, and 18 have been amended. Claims 15, 23, 25, 27, and 29 have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-14, 16-22, 24, 26, 28, and 30 are presented for further examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-14, 16-22, 24, 26, 28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078161 (hereinafter Cheng), in view of Graziano et al., United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0111698 (hereinafter Graziano).

4. With respect to claims 1, 6, 13, 18, 24, 26, 28, and 30, Cheng teaches an apparatus [fig.1 and see abstract] comprising: an electronic device [i.e. UPnP controller (UCP) 120] for coupling to a home network system [figs.1-2], the electronic device having a memory device, the memory device contains the electronic device's ID

Art Unit: 2151

information, the ID information is a remote location's complete address [i.e. IP address] to a page storing one of control and characteristic information for the electronic device, one of the control and the characteristic information is retrieved from the remote location if the home network system does not have the one of control and the characteristic information stored [paragraphs 0019 and 0025-0033], and the electronic device is polled periodically for the ID information [figs.4&6 and paragraphs 0026-0032 and 0053-0067].

However, Cheng does not explicitly show the home network system achieves plug-n-play like operability for the electronic device without using a plug and play protocol, and the device does not transmit service requests.

In a communication apparatus, Graziano suggests or discloses the home network system achieves plug-n-play like operability [i.e. detecting even that occurred on a home device, step **1002** of fig.10] for the electronic device without using a plug and play protocol [For example, Graziano teaches home attendant **31** detects event that occurred on a home device **30a-30n**, step **1002** of fig.10. Further, Graziano discloses or suggests home attendant **31** communicates with home device **40a-40n**, see fig.3, using X10 protocol, see fig.11 and paragraph 0040], and the device does not transmit service requests [fig.11].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cheng in view of Graziano by achieving plug-n-play operability using a plug and play protocol because this feature allow a user to directly access home attendant and to generate an/or modify configuration information and/or control and/or monitor home devices [Graziano, paragraph 0048]. It is for this

Art Unit: 2151

reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to control various home devices [Graziano, paragraph 0006].

5. With respect to claims 2, 8, and 16, Cheng further teaches the complete address includes one of a complete uniform resource locator (URL) and a complete Internet protocol (IP) address to a specific page for the electronic device [paragraph 0027].

6. With respect to claims 3 and 8, Cheng further teaches the electronic device's characteristics and control information is maintained at the remote location [fig.1 and paragraphs 0028-0030].

7. With respect to claims 4 and 10, Cheng further teaches the electronic device is a consumer electronic (CE) device [120 i.e. UPnP controller].

8. With respect to claims 5 and 12, Cheng further teaches the electronic device transmits the complete device identification information [paragraph 0066 i.e. a service identification] on a device specific bus [205] when coupled to the device specific bus [figs.1-2 and paragraphs 0008-0009].

9. With respect to claim 7, Cheng further teaches a central processing device [130 i.e. file server] coupled to the home network; a central memory device coupled to the

Art Unit: 2151

central processing device; and a display coupled to the central processing device [paragraphs 0040-0058].

10. With respect to claim 11, Cheng further teaches the remote network is one of the Internet and an Intranet [paragraphs 0008-0009].

11. With respect to claims 14 and 19, Cheng further teaches using the device's characteristic information to control the device; determining whether the stored characteristic information needs to be updated; and replacing the stored characteristic information with new characteristic information if the stored characteristic information needs to be updated [paragraphs 0018-0030].

12. With respect to claims 17 and 22, Cheng further teaches displaying information on a display device [fig.1 and paragraphs 0004-0007].

### ***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments filed January 26, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following: Cheng teaches an apparatus [fig.1 and see abstract] comprising: an electronic device [i.e. UPnP controller (UCP) 120] for coupling to a home network system [figs.1-2], the electronic device having a memory device, the memory device contains the electronic device's ID information, the ID information is a remote location's complete address [i.e. IP address] to a page storing

Art Unit: 2151

one of control and characteristic information for the electronic device, one of the control and the characteristic information is retrieved from the remote location if the home network system does not have the one of control and the characteristic information stored [paragraphs 0019 and 0025-0033], and the electronic device is polled periodically for the ID information [figs.4&6 and paragraphs 0026-0032 and 0053-0067]. However, Cheng does not explicitly show the home network system achieves plug-n-play like operability for the electronic device without using a plug and play protocol, and the device does not transmit service requests. In a communication apparatus, Graziano suggests or discloses the home network system achieves plug-n-play like operability [i.e. detecting even that occurred on a home device, step **1002** of fig.10] for the electronic device without using a plug and play protocol [For example, Graziano teaches home attendant **31** detects event that occurred on a home device **30a-30n**, step **1002** of fig.10. Further, Graziano discloses or suggests home attendant **31** communicates with home device **40a-40n**, see fig.3, using X10 protocol, see fig.11 and paragraph 0040], and the device does not transmit service requests [fig.11]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cheng in view of Graziano by achieving plug-n-play operability using a plug and play protocol because this feature allow a user to directly access home attendant and to generate an/or modify configuration information and/or control and/or monitor home devices [Graziano, paragraph 0048]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to control various home devices [Graziano, paragraph 0006].

14. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F. 2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F. 2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant obviously attacks references individually without taking into consideration based on the teaching of combinations of references as show in the above.

15. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cheng in view of Graziano by achieving plug-n-play operability using a plug and play protocol because this feature allow a user to directly access home attendant and to generate an/or modify configuration information and/or control and/or monitor home devices [Graziano, paragraph 0048]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to control various home devices [Graziano, paragraph 0006].



16. In response to applicant's argument that Graziano does not teach, disclose, or suggest an electronic device is periodically polled for ID information. Examiner respectfully disagrees because Graziano suggests an electronic device is periodically polled for ID information [figs.4&6 and paragraphs 0026-0032 and 0053-0067].

### ***Conclusion***

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2151

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4067. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi Tran  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2151

January 5, 2007

  
RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER